



**US 113
Project Team**

Delaware Department of Transportation
Sussex County
Whitman, Requardt and Associates, LLP
Rummel, Klepper & Kahl, LLP
Kramer & Associates, Inc.

Working Group Meeting Notes

**Date of
Meeting:**

March 10, 2004

Time:

5:30 PM – 8:35 PM

Location:

Millsboro Volunteer Fire Company Banquet Hall

Topic:

**US 113 North/South Study
Millsboro-South Area Working Group
Meeting No. 2**

Attendees: See attached

DRAFT

The following is a summary of the meeting discussion:

- ▶ Bob Kramer called the meeting to order and thanked the Working Group members for attending the second meeting. The Working Group members then identified themselves and their affiliations.
- ▶ Eric Buehl indicated that he was representing Bruce Richards. Rick Duncan indicated that he was representing Gary Taylor.
- ▶ The meeting was then turned over to Ms. Wicks, Chief Engineer for DelDOT, for opening comments. She indicated that a scheduling conflict made it impossible for her to attend the first meeting, but she hoped to get to know everyone during the duration of this study. She indicated that DelDOT has been successful with its projects when the public outreach has been comprehensive. DelDOT has learned to listen and the Working Group is closest to the situation. No matter how well the Project Team thinks it understands the area and its needs, it does not know these as well as the Working Group does. The Working Group's role from this day forward is very important in identifying the problems and needs from its perspective and conveying those problems and needs to the Project Team. She presented the analogy of the three-legged stool. Defining the problem and developing transportation solutions to address short, medium and long-term needs is one leg of the stool. Support for growth and economic development by matching transportation infrastructure with development is the second leg. The third leg of the stool is environmental resources and the preservation of the community values that are important to the community. This project will hit a home run if the transportation problem can be solved, the environment enhanced and growth supported.
- ▶ Ms. Wicks explained that the purpose of the Working Group is to develop alternatives, debate these alternatives and make recommendations. She also emphasized that the Working Group is part of a larger overall process including public meetings, small groups, individuals and environmental agencies. She emphasized the Department's commitment and the significance of the study to DelDOT. She stated that the Department has placed talented people on this project and introduced Don Plows, Monroe Hite III and Maureen Mauger. She also indicated that the DelDOT Team is supported by an experienced consulting team. She said that the Working Group had its work cut out as transportation solutions are extremely challenging today.

- ▶ Finally, Ms. Wicks explained the partnership with the County and how that partnership would serve the Working Group well in terms of communicating changes at the county and municipal level. She ended by thanking the participants for their participation.
- ▶ Mr. Kramer explained that there was an aggressive schedule/agenda for the evening and introduced Monroe Hite to kick it off.
- ▶ Mr. Hite thanked Ms. Wicks for her remarks and thanked the group for attending. He reviewed the handouts for the project notebook, including a copy of the PowerPoint Presentation that members could use to follow the presentation, meeting notes from the first meeting and study schedule. He indicated that there was a proposed change in the schedule that would be discussed later in the meeting.
- ▶ He reviewed recent meetings in which the Project Team participated and upcoming meetings involving the Project Team. He indicated Notebooks for those Working Group members that were unable to attend the first meeting and the make-up meeting had been mailed. The presentation items from the first meeting and the meeting notes have been placed on the project website and materials from this meeting will be posted on the website 3 or 4 days following this meeting. An update from the upcoming April 8, 2004 Agency meeting will be provided to the Working Group at the next meeting. He then indicated that the next meeting is proposed to be combined with a field tour, which will occur prior to the meeting. He concluded by emphasizing that the work product is still in draft form and does not represent recommendations or preferred options of either the Working Group or Project Team.
- ▶ Mr. Hite then turned the meeting back to Mr. Kramer to review the Working Group's first homework assignment: Working Group Guidelines. Mr. Kramer explained the need for the Working Group to agree on the Guidelines as they will set the ground rules for how the Working Group functions and communicates. He briefly reviewed the guidelines for how the Working Group will interact with each other and asked if there were any questions regarding that portion of the guidelines. Hearing none, he accepted silence as concurrence.
- ▶ He then reviewed how the Working Group will make recommendations, emphasizing the need for a super majority of 75% of members present for approval of a recommended action. Again, he asked if there were any questions and again hearing none he accepted silence as concurrence.
- ▶ Finally, he reviewed how the Working Group will communicate with those on the outside. He asked if there were any questions and again hearing none, accepted silence as concurrence.
- ▶ Mr. Kramer then introduced the Working Group's second homework assignment: Vision, Goals and Objectives of the Working Group for the study area. Mr. Kramer explained that the Vision was the group's view of the future for their area. He asked if there were any questions. Hearing none, he accepted silence as concurrence with the draft Vision that was provided to the Working Group.
- ▶ He then introduced the draft Goals and Objectives. Mr. Kramer indicated that the Goals and Objectives would serve as the basis/criteria for evaluating alternatives in the future.
- ▶ Peter Frederick asked if the word "separation", referring to the separation of through (regional) and seasonal traffic from local traffic, meant that the Goals were implying separate roads as the solution. It was indicated that was not the intent and that the separation of traffic did not necessarily mean separate roads as solutions. Accepting that explanation, the Working Group accepted the Goals as drafted.

- ▶ Mr. Kramer then asked for comments on the Objectives. Under the heading Aesthetics, Mr. Frederick indicated that “maintain and enhance” the character implied that everyone knows what the character is, but character is subjective. It was indicated to the Working Group that they needed to convey to the Project Team what their interpretation of community character is now and what they wanted that character to be in the future.
- ▶ Ms. Wicks noted that the question of character ties in with the next bullet under Aesthetics regarding the use of context sensitive design as one possible avenue to go above and beyond a straight-forward solution to add additional options to that solution that would address the issue of character and maintaining character in the communities or areas that might be affected.
- ▶ Preston Dyer asked that the Governor's Livable Delaware Initiative be added to the third bullet under Land Use Planning. He said that many of the comprehensive plans are changing, making that objective somewhat of a moving target. However, Livable Delaware Initiatives are established and most people understand them which supports that objective. The Working Group agreed to the change.
- ▶ Mr. Dyer also asked about seasonal traffic and how it is defined. He indicated that some seasonal traffic becomes local and how was that to be dealt with. Tom Hannan explained that seasonal, and through, traffic does not have an origin or destination in the study area and is generally more interested in uninterrupted highway service. Tom indicated that a seasonal traveler, who might stop in an area for various reasons (gas, food, lodging, etc.), will be accommodated in the long range plan, but not necessarily as directly as today. Tom indicated that extensive traffic analysis was underway and would be discussed with the Working Group at an upcoming meeting.
- ▶ .
- ▶ Richard Kautz raised the point that Mobility was only one side of the issue and asked if we really talking about access. He suggested that the title for the objective currently labeled Mobility be changed to Mobility/Accessibility. He did not want people to think that the Working Group was only worrying about through traffic and not addressing access for local residents/businesses. Mike Simmons indicated that it would be a goal of this group to address both mobility and accessibility. Lynn Bullock asked if that meant access for both through and local traffic. Mr. Hite indicated that it meant both. Tom Hannan indicated that the road system accommodates different types of uses. For instance US 113, because of the nature of the road, should provide a high level of mobility, which it does, but at the same time it is also currently providing considerable access. The Working Group agreed to change the heading to Mobility/Accessibility.
- ▶ Peter Frederick questioned the need to even address seasonal traffic. If it will work in December, shouldn't it work in July? Mr. Kramer indicated that comments from the listening tour repeatedly referred to addressing seasonal traffic and the difference in traffic as a result of the seasonal influx of traffic to southern Delaware. Mr. Frederick asked if we weren't simply dealing with a volume issue since the seasonal traffic simply passes through this area of the state. Tom Hannan indicated that the traffic modeling effort would take seasonal traffic into consideration.
- ▶ Robert Stuart indicated that the character of Millsboro today may not be the character in two or three years. Hundreds of homes are coming and, in turn, so will thousands of new automobile trips. Lynn Bullock concurred that 2900 homes are currently in planning for the Millsboro area and plans to annex some of the remaining properties to accommodate that growth into the town are underway. Wouldn't that interfere with possible solutions and possibly force solutions farther out. When will decisions be made? Mr. Hite indicated that the proposed study is expected to take 18 months. At that point, it is expected that a series of projects would have been developed for inclusion in the Department's CTP

for authorization and prioritization. Mr. Kramer indicated that the planning horizon for this study was 20 years into the future. The questions of what and where the communities want to be in 10 to 20 years will define the character of those communities in the future. Ms. Wicks indicated that the study will allow the Department to choose solutions and preserve right of way for those solutions if necessary. Preston Dyer indicated that the study needs to address planned growth. Tom Shafer indicated that the study will be reviewing current and proposed comprehensive plans for the various communities and the County within the project area. He further indicated that through his experiences with the development of the County's Comprehensive Plan that the communities know their character and what they want their character to be in the future. He indicated that the solutions that are developed for this study must benefit Sussex County residents. Tom Hannan indicated that traffic modeling will help predict the impact of the planned growth. Mr. Hite indicated that some of this discussion will be further addressed in the upcoming presentation.

- ▶ Mr. Kramer reviewed the items that the Working Group had agreed to change in the Goals and Objectives; the revised labeling of the Mobility Objective to Mobility/Accessibility and the inclusion of the Governor's Livable Delaware Initiatives in the Land Use Planning Objective and reaffirmed the Working Group's desire to incorporate those changes.
- ▶ Mr. Kramer then introduced Tom Heil to review the Constraints Mapping with the Group. As Tom was presenting the plethora of information on the constraints maps, Richard Kautz asked a question regarding the black lines on the Existing Land Use Map. It was indicated to Mr. Kautz that the lines were the utility corridors associated with the Indian River Power Plant. At the conclusion of his presentation, with all the constraint layers shown at one time, Tom emphasized the need to balance impacts to all resources. He indicated the need to work in a coordinated effort with all parties concerned to develop the "least impactful alternative".
- ▶ Mr. Kramer raised the rhetorical question, how do you build improvements through this? He indicated the challenge for the Working Group is to develop recommendations on solutions to address this problem.
- ▶ After a short break, Jeff Riegner continued the discussion by reviewing the On-alignment strategies.
- ▶ Peter Frederick asked if the Tool Box included strategies to address crossovers and interconnections between frontage roads and the limited access US 113. Jeff indicated that the tools to provide the connections were not so much items in the Tool Box as they were normal engineering practices for developing interchanges, slip ramps, grade separations, etc.
- ▶ Joe Wutka then discussed the application of the strategies in the area just north of Selbyville.
- ▶ Mr. Riegner followed with a similar discussion for the area in Millsboro from Betts Pond to SR 24
- ▶ John Thoroughgood indicated that improving North/South mobility doesn't address Millsboro's issue of East/West mobility. He indicated that Millsboro was directly in the path of motorists traveling to the beach. Jeff indicated that improving North/South mobility would help mobility in the East/West direction. Traffic signals would in some cases be eliminated reducing backups on the side (east/west) streets. Tom Hannan explained that Route 50 on either side of the Bay Bridge is an example of the things that Jeff was describing and the type of techniques or strategies that the Project Team would be reviewing for Millsboro.
- ▶ There was considerable discussion concerning the issue of East/West mobility and how it greatly affects many of the towns in the study area, more so than US 113. Tom Hannan indicated that the

East/West connection issue would be reviewed in conjunction with the traffic modeling and analysis. Lynn Bullock asked if Millsboro would have unimpeded East-West access as a result of this study and the implementation of its recommendations. He indicated that that would clear up Millsboro's current traffic problem.

- ▶ At this point, the discussion moved from the On-alignment strategies to the Off-alignment options. Mr. Kramer stressed the emphasis of the study was the On-alignment opportunities. In conjunction with that, Working Group members were also reminded that in the development of alternatives they can mix and match options. The solution is not one size fits all. Mr. Kramer then turned the discussion over to Mr. Riegner to review the Off-alignment options west of Millsboro.
- ▶ Jeff went through a review of the Off-alignment options west of Millsboro.
- ▶ Lynn Bullock indicated that the western Off-alignment options are obsolete because development proposals are going through Millsboro's planning process and will be annexed into the town by June that are located within the proposed Off-alignment corridor options.
- ▶ Mr. Riegner indicated that even though the options are draft/tentative, they serve as the basis for opening a dialogue with the town and the developer. Jeff indicated that through working with all parties involved, it might be possible to work out a plan for phasing the development, with portions of the development proposal moving ahead that might not be impacted, preserving lands for a possible alignment around Millsboro, should that be the eventual outcome, while the study is working toward solutions.
- ▶ Joe Wutka then went through a discussion of the Off-alignment options east of Millsboro. Following that discussion, a question was raised about the possibility of using the portion of the easterly option around Millsboro from US 113 to SR 24 as part of a solution to address Millsboro's East/West concern. Mr. Kramer and Monroe reminded the Group that pieces of each option could be mixed and matched.
- ▶ Jim Bennett raised the issue of Air Quality conformity. Tom Heil indicated that Air Quality conformity would be addressed through the environmental documentation process when alternatives have been retained for further study. Tom indicated that many of the On-alignment options, including the provision of frontage roads, may not require analysis since these options could be perceived as not providing additional capacity. However, the Off-alignment options could not be argued similarly.
- ▶ Mr. Riegner then reviewed the Off-alignment options west of Dagsboro. Jeff continued with a discussion of options west of Frankford. Mr. Wutka then reviewed options east of Frankford and Dagsboro. Jeff finished the discussion with a review of options west of Selbyville.
- ▶ Roger Marino asked when it is considered too late to preserve right of way. Both Mr. Hite and Mr. Riegner responded that there were opportunities throughout the process. From advanced acquisitions and protective purchases during the process to setting up an advanced acquisition program once a selected alternative has been chosen.
- ▶ Peter Frederick raised the question of bleeding people off at SR 24 and SR 26 and by doing so; there would be no need to convert US 113 to limited access south of the bleed offs. Tom Hannan indicated that the traffic studies would give the Working Group members a better feel for this issue.

- ▶ Mr. Hite then took over the discussion and indicated that the examples that were shown at the meeting were not hard and fast. He stressed the development of On-Alignment options was the first priority in the study and that that would be the focus of the next meeting.
- ▶ Monroe suggested that the next meeting be changed to May 19, 2004 and combined with a field tour where the On-Alignment options could be reviewed in the field. The field tour would begin at 4:00 pm with the Working Group boarding a bus at the Fire Hall and proceeding to US 113. The regular meeting would then follow the field review. The Working Group agreed and members asked that the change in meeting date be put out via e-mail.
- ▶ Mr. Kramer asked how many would be unable to attend the May 19, 2004 Field Tour/Working Group Meeting. Only Preston Dyer raised his hand. Mr. Kramer explained that the change in date had to do with the amount and thoroughness needed to prepare the work to assure that all options are considered for presentation to the Working Group at the next meeting.
- ▶ Mr. Hite adjourned the meeting at 8:35.
- ▶ Following the adjournment, some Working Group members stayed to discuss issues related to the mapping. Several members turned in maps with comments that they had made during and after the discussion.



US 113 NORTH SOUTH STUDY

MILLSBORO-SOUTH AREA WORKING GROUP

MEETING NO. 2

March 10, 2004

5:30 PM – 8:30 PM

Millsboro Volunteer Fire Company Banquet Hall

ATTENDANCE (Indicated by √)	WORKING GROUP MEMBERS	REPRESENTING
	Atherton, Ronald	Frankford Town Council
	Becton, Thea	First State Community Action Agency
√	Bennett, Jim	Bennett Orchard
√	Boyce, Joan	Millsboro/Dagsboro Chamber of Commerce
√	Bullock, Lynn	Millsboro Volunteer Fire Company
	Collins, Donald	Sussex County Farm Bureau
√	Connor, S. Bradley	Mayor, Dagsboro
	Daisey, Robert	Business Owner
	Davis, Mark	Delaware Department of Agriculture
	Dismuke, Charles	Frankford Planning Commission
√	Dyer, Preston	Developer
√	Frederick, Peter	Councilman, Fenwick Island
√	Kautz, Richard	Sussex County Planning & Zoning Commission
	Lingo, Faye	Town Manager, Millsboro
√	Marino, Roger	Mountaire Farms, Inc.
	McGrath, Karen	Bethany/Fenwick Chamber of Commerce
√	Mitchell, John	Indian River School District
√	Mitchell, Margaret	Millsboro Historical Society
√	Norwood, Tran	Nanticoke Indian Association
	Parker, Clifton	Farmer
√	Pfaff, Bill	Delaware Small Business Development Center
√ Eric Buehl for	Richards, Bruce	Center for the Inland Bays
√	Simmons, Mike	Project Development (South Region), DelDOT
√	Stuart, Robert	Sussex County Emergency Medical Services
√ Rich Duncan for	Taylor, Gary	Town Manager, Selbyville
√	Thoroughgood, John	Millsboro Town Council, Planning Commission
	Townshend, Ann Marie	Office of State Planning Coordination
	VonVille, Marissa	La Esperanza, Inc.
√	Warrington, Michael	Delaware State Police, Troop 4
√	White, George	Townsend, Inc.

MILLSBORO-SOUTH WORKING GROUP

MEETING NO. 2

March 10, 2004
5:30 PM – 8:30 PM
Millsboro Volunteer Fire Company Banquet Hall

CITIZENS	REPRESENTING (if applicable)	ADDRESS
Adam Huber	Sussex Countian	Georgetown
Derrick Kenney	ORA	
Kevin McBride	MRA	Georgetown